HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

VOL. XII, No. 1 — JANUARY 1, 1955

Behind The Thought Control Curtain: Congress begins the new year under the usual smoke-barrage of New Deal Republican and Democratic propaganda. Here is how realistic members of Congress appraise signs of these "lines" of "thought control."

● "Will Ike run again in 1956?" The current "planted" reports in the press are "old stuff." The same game went on under Roosevelt and Truman. Whether or not the President has any serious intention of running again is beside the point. He has to appear likely to do so, if he's to wield authority over his party. The White House clique has to keep up the refrain of "run again" for they want to keep their jobs. No member of Congress excludes the possibility that the incumbent may finally decide not to run, recalling the case of Truman in 1952.

The Democratic President at that time acted as if he would "choose to run" right up to the time (*circa* April, 1952) when Kefauver inflicted on him the defeat in the New Hampshire primary. Then, quite evidently, Truman took a pessimistic view of his chances of success for re-election, and withdrew. The same could happen a year hence in the case of Eisenhower — such is a frequent comment here. Indeed, members who dwell on the Administration's recent defeat in the off-year election think it quite possible a similar sequence of events may occur in 1956. That's why the name of Knowland is on many lips.

● What's the truth about the "free trade" or reciprocal trade agreements demanded by the White House? Some western members — old "free traders" — deride the "trade not aid" slogan. The reduction of tariffs, they say does not signify "free trade," because the benefiting foreign nations have a lot of other restraints on trade — monetary, and bilateral pacts, subsidies — which render "reciprocal" measures by the U.S. a farce. The real "pitch," say some shrewd observers, is that "free trade" is simply another device to subsidize the foreign countries at the expense of various U.S. industries. In other words, this slogan of "free trade" really signifies "foreign aid."

● Preliminary propaganda salvos are being fired in a developing campaign to prevent Undersecretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., from reorganizing and making efficient the Department of State. The line is, "foreign service officers and career State Department officials are losing their morale because of security regulations." The recent focus of the campaign was the ousting of John P. Davies, long a target of McCarthy criticism, recommended dropped by a high-level board of Admirals and Generals. The "liberal" propaganda pretends that these "harassed" officials dare not do their work honestly and many are thinking of retiring. This brings a gravelly laugh from veteran observers who have never seen these "chair-warmers" leave their comfortable jobs unless they really have to do so, by pressure or exposure. Why does the press run such stories? It's a "pay-off," say those who know about "the care and feeding of reporters" in the nation's capital. The reporter gets his tidbits of exclusive news from the said "harassed" officials, in return for his help in bolstering their case against the stern security regulations.

● Another wry smile appears among veteran correspondents over the hubbub of the Democrats about "civil service." The Democrats clamor that the Eisenhower Administration is seeking to scuttle

Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"civil service" by naming some thousands of deserving Republicans to replace Democrats in the swollen bureaucracy. Of course, "civil service" and the "spoils system" were realities back in the time of Grover Cleveland. But the Democrats in their twenty-year reign swamped the ranks of Government with Democrats; Truman in his last years blanketed a mass of such purely political appointees (many of them Communists and fellow-travellers) into the civil service ranks. But does the Eisenhower move mean that real Republicans will now have a chance to get jobs? No, it is expected that the White House clique will fill the jobs with New Deal Republicans of the "Citizens for Eisenhower" organization variety.

Talk About '56: Hidden under fragrant swathes of tributes to Ike's popularity and a very determined silence about his defeat in the elections last November, there is some realistic talk going on about his chances for re-election, if he runs.

The boys here who receive high pay for delivering "cold turkey" estimates on such matters to their (usually) hard-headed business clients are suggesting the strong probability that a Democrat will win the presidency in 1956. (Not all these clients like to hear that; for many tycoons like Ike because they think he's a Republican.) Recently, the lobbyist brethren here were very admiring of the courage of Mr. Walter Chamblin, Washington head of the National Association of Manufacturers, when — in his December 7 Bulletin to members — he put it up to them thus:

"If you analyze the House vote (of November 2) in terms of a presidential election you get this: In the 11 old Confederate states there are 130 electoral votes. Outside of the Confederacy there are 37 states with 401 electoral votes. The Democrats won 15 of these states with 187 electoral votes. Add 187 to 130 Confederate state votes and you have 317 electoral votes for Democrats. On the other hand, the Republicans won 22 states with an electoral vote of 214. Thus if a president had been running in the last election and had received a vote similar to that received by House candidates you would have had a Democratic president elected by a majority of 103 electoral votes. Consequently, on the basis of the last election, the Democratic swing again is up. . . ."

What particularly impresses these students of election statistics is the bitter fruits of the White House persecution of McCarthy. The Wisconsin Senator, of course, has a big following all over the country. However, it is recalled that it was this following in the narrowly contested big-city states of the East which swung the election to Ike in 1952. But when Ike patted Senator Watkins on the back several weeks ago, he shut the door on the possibility of capturing this group again in 1956.

Can he, to compensate, win other groups in these crucial states? In 1952, he failed to get the "Jewish vote" and "Negro vote" in New York; and in '54 his favorite, Ives, did no better in the election in that state. Observers believe that these two minorities are indissolubly wedded to the Democratic Party. Hence, without their support, and that of the McCarthyites, the President's chances of obtaining the 45 electoral votes of New York state are dim, indeed. And, students of election statistics sternly remind us: "No Republican has ever been elected President without the electoral votes of New York."

The Facts of Foreign Aid: On December 9, the British Government in its 18th report on "Anglo-American cooperation" (published as a government white paper) stated that Britain received $3,597,-500,000 in "aid from the U.S. in the six years from 1948 to last June 30."

Now, the statement is unquestionably correct, but it gives to a hasty reader an impression that post-war aid is less than it actually is. The real question is exactly how much aid have we given Britain *since the end of the war?* Why select six years (1948 to 1954)? Why simply specify outright gifts from the government? Why not include gifts from private sources? Why exclude "loans outstanding"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which are certainly aid and which, moreover, may never be paid or only paid in small part (as with those in World War I)?

The question (which no official statements honestly answer) is: what has Britain received from the United States since the end of the war (World War II) in outright gifts from the government or private agencies, or in outstanding loans? Now, on Capitol Hill, it is well known that no Government agency has ever assembled the complete statistical picture of post-war foreign aid. It took us a lot of work to get a tentatively reliable answer to the foregoing question, but the answer obtained — from Government statisticians who have unofficially reported it to us — exposes the British white paper's selection of the time period and failure to include even in that selected period, "loans outstanding."

We offer the picture — in approximate round figures — not only to our subscribers, but especially to Congress. Next week we shall reveal the figures on aid to France; in following weeks, aid to Italy and other nations.

Here is the picture of the real magnitude of American aid to Britain.

(1) From July 1, 1945 through June 30, 1954, we gave Britain (outright gifts from our Treasury) $4,225,055,000. This is broken down into: (a) UNRRA — $8,369,000; (b) Technical Exchange Program — $732,000; (c) economic assistance, 1948 through June 30, 1954 — $3,786,000,000 ($200,000,000 above the white paper estimate of the British government); (d) surplus products which we gave England to sell — $72,200,000; (e) American Red Cross, a private agency — $16,207,000 (no figures available from another agency, CARE); (f) lend-lease *after* the conclusion of World War II and prior to war in Korea — $341,547,000. (The latter item was a clear gouge. Why, after the termination of hostilities should lend-lease have been continued?)

(2) At present the British government has outstanding loans, payable to the U.S. Treasury, of $5,076,361,000. This item is broken down into: (a) direct loan to the British Government of $3,750,000,000 in 1945 on which $3,660,441,000 is outstanding; (b) $384,800,000 from the American Export-Import Bank, outstanding; (c) $390,000,000 from the RFC, outstanding; (d) $62,720,000 in silver subject to terms of repayment but at present outstanding; (e) $538,400,000 of credit advanced by the government to be ultimately paid back but still outstanding and unamortized; (f) $40,000,000 credit extended on surplus property and unpaid.

(3) Total *military aid* to Britain from fiscal 1950 through fiscal 1954 is $905,000,000.

In short, *total aid* (civilian and military) to Britain since the end of World War II amounts to $10,206,416,000.

This is practically three times the aid reported by the British white paper for the selected period for the six years 1948 "to last June 30." But even the "three times figure" does not include other items which have been a direct charge against the American taxpayer. Let us cite just two: (1) Under lend-lease we gave the British $28,600,797,000 worth of American war materials. Under reverse lend-lease, the British charged us with $5,300,000,000, leaving a total of over $23,000,000,000. Granted that a considerable portion of this 23 billions was used up, there remains the vital question of how many ships (mercantile and naval) the British have kept. Our sources indicate that they have retained a number of such vessels. These were clearly returnable to the U.S. But the whole lend-lease account was hurriedly cast up at the end of World War II and its equitable accuracy is highly suspect. There is still another item which has not even been considered in estimating direct American aid to Britain. In the NATO "*infra structure program,*" we are given no credit for building airfields, fuel storage tanks and the like, in Britain, all of which contribute directly to the prosperity of England through the outlay of *American dollars.* So, in addition to the over $10 billion of civilian and military aid to Britain must be added *millions* (probably many hundreds of millions), because of a careless adjudication of lend-lease and our contributions to the "infra NATO structure."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Socialism: Sleeping or Creeping? Although the U.S.A. is proud of its free-enterprise system and the 1952 Presidential election put a roadblock (albeit of uncertain size) in the path of welfare staters, viewed in historical perspective, the advance of socialism in this country should give us all pause. The point is well made in an article, "The Lengthening Shadow of Government," by Edmund A. Opitz, published by the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y. Rev. Optiz reports that in 1902, three percent of our national wealth was owned by government; in 1922, nine percent; in 1939, thirteen percent; in 1946, 22 percent and today about 27 percent. And the trend continues.

Take electric power. In 1903, Federal power production began. Today it is almost 11 percent of the total and, with the completion of present construction projects, will be 15.4 percent by the end of 1955. Add state and local government ownership and the percentage is 23.8 — almost a fourth. Atomic power will be 100 percent a Federal monopoly.

In education, Rev. Opitz notes, the Federal Government, in 1947, spent just about half of what it cost our colleges to operate. Of the nation's total educational budget, taking in all levels of government, the percentage is 90. "In nearly every line of endeavor," he adds, "there is a repetition of the same story . . . Government encroaches more and more upon the area of personal relations . . . no matter what our occupation or station in life."

That the Federal Government is engaged in all sorts of "welfare" activities — including building and operation of golf courses for the military, running grocery stores, recapping tires, providing life insurance, supplying free hospital and medical services, constructing public housing, etc. — is due to the power of groups of voters exercised through the Congress or often simply to the careless delegation of power by Congress to the Executive branch. Thus socialism is advanced.

Education Front: Mississippi, on December 21, struck a blow against state monopoly of education, when citizens voted — in a referendum — for a constitutional amendment to permit legislation abolishing state-supported schools.

The immediate issue, true, was the thorny question of segregation and the *mores* of Mississippi dictated a choice whereby that state might maintain the traditional racial separation in schools despite the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in favor of a Federal ban on segregation in public schools. But, those who have battled for many years against the supremacy of the State in matters of education perceive in this Mississippi move a means by which the traditional State monopoly in education can be breached. In an article, "A Solution of Our Public School Problem" in HUMAN EVENTS on May 15, 1954, Frank Chodorov said: "The public school is a socialized or politically monopolized institution and suffers from the weaknesses inherent in all monopolies. . . . Nothing will do more to better education in America than the breaking of the public school trust." And alluding to the various proposals for effecting this, Chodorov pointed out that such plans would put the public schools "into competition with the free-enterprise schools, so that they can prove their worth."

What happened in Mississippi is not unique in the South. The amendment passed on December 21 in that state is similar to those approved in Georgia and South Carolina. But the provision which potentially holds the greatest promise of breaking state monopoly in education is the one which permits the Legislature to turn school facilities over to private groups and to subsidize private schools.

Day of Publication Changed: Beginning with the next issue, HUMAN EVENTS will reach you ONE DAY LATER than heretofore. But the advantage to you will be that we will be going to press TWO days later. In the past, HUMAN EVENTS has been covering Washington developments up to Wednesday. After this week, we shall be protecting you on Congressional and White House news up to Friday night. We hope that you will be pleased with the change.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office; Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $6. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.50, six months, $6.50. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $13; foreign (regular mail) one year, $12. Foreign airmail, $18. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. *Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.* Bound annual volume with index, $15.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XII, No. 1 HUMAN EVENTS JANUARY 1, 1955

WAS IT PLANNED THAT WAY?

By FREDA UTLEY

NOW THAT SOME Republicans are wondering whether Eisenhower is not more Democratic than the Democrats in foreign policy, it is interesting to note what the British press had to say about him during the 1952 campaign. The London *Times,* in particular, can be congratulated on having realized that the Britain Firsters and the neutralists and appeasers had nothing to fear from a Republican victory. On October 16, 1952, for instance, the Washington Correspondent of the *Times* wrote as follows:

> "Yesterday one columnist reported that the General's old staff at NATO had been told by him before he left not to be alarmed by anything he might do or say during the campaign. He would do, he said, according to this report, whatever was necessary to get nominated and then he would do whatever was necessary to get elected. Once he was in the White House, however, he would be the man they had always known." [The "old staff," it should be explained, contained many British officers.]

The *Times* further reassured its readers that, although Walter Lippmann was "in anguish" at the evidence that Eisenhower was "adjusting his position to the demands of the local political machines" and failing to speak in the same "accents of greatness" as Stevenson, columnist Joseph Alsop was reporting that:

> "The General, now that he has left the Middle West behind is going to talk like an internationalist and, once elected, is going to forget the McCarthys and Jenners and modernize the Republican Party."

Today it is clear that the *Times* was right in placing more credence in Alsop's views than in those expressed by Stevenson, whom it reported as saying in San Francisco:

> "There are some who say that the General intends to double-cross his new friends after the election. I do not believe either that the General is so unscrupulous or that they are so stupid."

Undoubtedly Eisenhower himself believes that he was "serving the nation" in "doing whatever was necessary to get elected." Those who believed in the Republican campaign promises to "roll back" the Communist power, and "liberate" the peoples enslaved by the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam agreements (or thanks to the Marshall-Acheson China policy), were no doubt less wise and foresighted than the London *Times,* which trusted Ike to revert to form after he got elected.

Remembering how willingly, or even enthusiastically, Eisenhower went along with Roosevelt and Marshall in trusting "Uncle Joe" during the war, one should not be surprised to hear him proclaiming now that there is "no alternative to peace" with the Communist empire. One need only compare what he wrote in *Crusade in Europe* with what he is saying today to realize that his misconceptions concerning the nature, aims and methods of Communism are unchanged. Today, as yesterday, Eisenhower imagines that the primary necessity to ensure peace and good will on earth is for *us* to prove *our* good faith and good intentions to the Communists.

Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In his book the President related how, on April 26, 1945, after the Germans had offered to surrender unconditionally to the Western Powers, he "strongly urged that no proposition be accepted or entertained unless it involved a surrender of all German forces on all fronts." He related how "until the very last" the "sole desire" of the Germans after Hitler's death "was to avoid surrender to the Russians," and in 1948, he was still proud, instead of ashamed, to recall how he had helped Moscow by his threat to "prevent by force any more German refugees from entering our lines," unless the German armies surrendered to the Communists at the same time as to us. The reason he gave was not the secret Yalta agreements, which had in any case already been broken by Stalin in his treatment of Poland, but his fear that "the Russians" would "accuse us of bad faith," if the Germans were permitted to surrender to us while continuing to fight desperately to keep the Red Army from overrunning Eastern Europe.

Today Eisenhower continues to imagine that good faith and good works can exorcise the Communist spectre which is haunting the world. At his press conference on December 3, he is reported by the *New York Times* to have said:

> ". . . we owe it to ourselves and to the world to explore every possible peaceable means of settling differences before we even think of such a thing as war. And the hard way is to have the courage to be patient, tirelessly to seek out every single avenue open to us in the hope even finally of *leading the other side to a little better understanding of the honesty of our intentions.*" (Italics added.)

IN A WORD, there was never any ground for the supposition that Eisenhower, if elected as President by Republican votes, would prove more capable of understanding and more courageous in combating Communism than the Truman-Marshall-Acheson combination. Under the so-called Republican Administration of our golf-loving President, the United States has proved itself even less capable than under the poker-playing Truman of calling the Communist bluff. Even the Kennan "containment" policy appears in retrospect as comparatively courageous, and as therefore having offered somewhat more hope for U.S. security and world peace, than the Eisenhower-Churchill formula for "peaceful co-existence." Certainly neither Truman nor Stevenson would have been able, even had they been willing, to follow the "peace at almost any price" policy which the Eisenhower Administration has adopted. The Republican opposition would have made the pursuit of any such pusillanimous policy impossible of achievement under a Democratic administration. It was necessary that the Republican Party should muzzle itself, if the U.S. were to follow the appeasement line desired by Britain and by the powerful forces in America which follow in her train. This objective was, at least temporarily, accomplished by selling the idea, back in 1952, that the Republican Party could emerge from the wilderness after 20 years only if it chose Ike.

In the spring of 1952, in a speech I made to the New York chapter of the D.A.R. in Washington, I suggested that choosing Eisenhower because he — rather than Taft — could ensure a Republican victory, was as illogical a policy as our "blank check" support of Stalin against Hitler to win the war. Not, of course, that Eisenhower himself is in any way comparable to either of the totalitarian dictators; but, if you choose to support a man who stands for the same ideas and policies as your opponents, you cannot expect to gain any advantage from victory.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Today it is much clearer than three years ago that Eisenhower received certain powerful financial and press support, not because he could defeat Truman or Stevenson, but because he could eliminate Taft and the truly American policies for which the late, great Senator from Ohio stood. This is not a wild surmise. Immediately after President Eisenhower's inauguration some "eager beavers" were already telling the world that he had been elected because he was expected to negotiate peace with the Soviet Empire. For instance, Mr. William R. Mathews, Editor and Publisher of the *Arizona Daily Star,* wrote an article for the Sunday *New York Times Magazine* Section in January, 1953, in which he said that there was a "deep and latent urge in the hearts of the American people" for a compromise peace; that Eisenhower had been chosen because he was less "stubborn" than Truman and was "about the only American able to come to an agreement with the Soviets." Similarly, John Sherman Cooper, the Republican Senator from Kentucky, stated on April 22, 1953, that the Eisenhower Administration should be prepared to risk adverse public opinion by making "limited concessions" in exchange for "peace" with the Communists in Asia.

TODAY THE WHOLE PACK of "liberal" columnists, commentators and editors who sought to destroy McCarthy are hot on the scent of Senator Knowland because he has dared to question the wisdom of the President's "noble" policy of "patience" in face of Communist provocation. The very same people who urged U.S. intervention in the second World War, now tell us that we should restrain our "emotional reaction" to Communist crimes against humanity and international law. They are delighted that Dulles' promise of "massive retaliation at times and places of our own choosing" has proved to be mere campaign oratory. When Eisenhower expressed satisfaction that the last time the Soviets shot down an American plane they were "courteous," and may even have had some justification for their action, a chorus of praise arose from the "liberals." But when Knowland suggested that the United States should threaten a blockade of China to force the Communists to release the American prisoners of war they are illegally holding, he was denounced as a war monger, or accused of encroaching on the Executive prerogative.

Anyone not blinded by illusions concerning the nature and aims of Communism knows that the Senator from California was eminently right when he told the Senate, on November 15, that:

> "the Communist concept of 'peaceful co-existence' means that the United States or other free nations of the world will be allowed to exist only until Communism is able to subvert them from within or destroy them by aggression from without . . . [ultimately] we shall be allowed the choice to surrender or die."

Every so often President Eisenhower tells us that we must be "good partners" and fit our policy to the requirements of "our allies" — meaning Britain and France, neither of which has any stomach for the struggle against Communism, but whom he persists in regarding as the only "allies" worth consideration. He does not scruple to exert strong pressure on those who Kipling called the "lesser breeds" by making our financial and military aid conditional on their undertaking *not to fight* for the liberation of their countrymen. Both Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee, instead of being encouraged to raise a banner in the East to which free men can repair, are now confined within the small

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

limits of the territory not yet conquered by our enemies by the threat that, should they ever dare to challenge the Communist power by "aggressive" action, we shall abandon them.

Similarly, in Europe, we are "permitting" the West Germans to rearm for the defense of Europe, only on condition that they promise never to use force to free their brothers in the East. In brief, so great is the desire of our "Republican" administration to "co-exist" in peace with the Communist Empire that we have served notice on the world that American aid will be given only to those who are prepared to follow our lead in appeasing the enemies of liberty.

There may be sound military reasons for such restraints on these allies; but there is something unfair about our treatment of them as contrasted with the lax handling of Britain and France.

THE SIGNS ARE as evident at home as abroad that Ike is determined to follow F.D.R. along a road proverbially paved with good intentions. The Voice of America, I am reliably informed, has softened its criticism of Communism in its broadcasts to Russia; and there are rumors that it is going to get rid of its Russian-born experts because they are "too prejudiced" against the Soviet power. Recently a Korean veteran, recipient of our Congressional Medal of Honor, told me that, before being demobilized, he had to promise never to speak about his experience as a prisoner of the Communists. This young man thought that the reason for the silence imposed upon him was the fear that American wives and mothers would raise an outcry against the drafting of their husbands and sons for service overseas, if it were known what horrible experiences awaited our prisoners of war. A more probable explanation of these "security" regulations is the Administration's fear of the anti-Communist reaction of the American people if the facts were known.

One needs only to observe the propensity of some papers to play down present Communist atrocities, as compared with the front page attention still given to old Nazi crimes, to realize that powerful influences are seeking to keep the old hate fires burning against the Germans, and to prevent the American people from becoming aware of the clear and present danger which menaces us from Soviet Russia.

Years ago, Lenin said that Communists should be prepared to take one step backward in order to be able to take two steps forward later. Stalin's successors are obviously acting on this principle. They need a breathing spell to establish their grip on their subjects following his death. They also need time to overcome the agricultural crisis in Russia and to extinguish the resistance in the satellite countries and in China. They operate with the knowledge that a battering ram has to be drawn backwards in order to strike with maximum force. Shall we permit them to make the necessary preparations to destroy us for the sake of "peace in our time?"

Additional Copies of SII (the article section): 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

Subscription rates are as follows: 3 months trial subscription, $3; 6 months subscription, $6; one year subscription, $10.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED